LIBRARY OF THE

MILITARISM,

OR

Military Fever:

ITS CAUSES, DANGERS AND CURE.

By

RICHARD H. THOMAS, M.D.,

OF BALTIMORE, MD.

PHILADELPHIA:

THE AMERICAN FRIEND PUB. CO.

1899.

172.4
T36

MILITARISM, OR MILITARY FEVER: ITS CAUSES, DANGERS AND CURE.

BY RICHARD H. THOMAS, M.D., OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Militarism, or military fever, is a condition which profoundly affects both individuals and nations. It and its allied states were for centuries held to be evidences of sound health; but long since certain careful observers showed that so far from this being the case, they are diseased conditions accompanying malnutrition and want of development of the higher powers of man.

The disease in one or other of its many forms is endemic in all latitudes, and is liable at any time to become locally epidemic.

In its acute form it is characterized by a high degree of febrile excitement, with great unrest, and often with violence of thought and language, in which symptoms of pride and arrogance are generally, though not invariably, mingled. Nearly always there is a distortion of vision, with an utter inability to see any side of a question but one, and even this only in the light of what the patients call glory and renown. In such cases the disorder often culminates in an eruption, known as war, which, to use a well-known expression, is the sum of all cruelties, and in which thousands may be wounded or killed, an enormous amount of property be destroyed, homes rendered desolate, a grievous burden of debt left behind, and the

whole moral tone of a people lowered, with an alarming increase of crime against person and property.

In certain cases, the more prominent feeling before the outbreak appears to be a stern sense of duty, but even in such instances the result is very much the same.

In its sub-acute and chronic form, the condition in modern times shows itself in the expenditure of great sums in armaments, forts, implements of warfare, the training of large bodies of men as soldiers, in standing armies, etc., all of which are a severe burden to the people, a serious and constant injury to their moral life, and a menace to their liberties, while a condition of chronic nervous irritability in national governments is produced, in which every unintentional slight and every misunderstanding becomes a possible cause for a fresh eruption of war.

The disease is probably the most contagious known to man. Perhaps no nation has wholly escaped it, and probably no individuals exposed to the infection have failed to be attacked, unless they had been previously well protected.

As I have said, even acute attacks were for a long time universally regarded as evidences of health, and, speaking broadly, very many still so regard them. Down to the present day, great teachers of mankind, poets, artists, historians, instructors—yes, sometimes even the professing Church of Christ in its organized capacity—exalt the military hero as a true pattern for our youth, and extol military glory as a very high attainment of vigorous manhood. The number of these is, however, steadily diminishing, and the ranks of advanced and truly scientific observers are continually being recruited. Among

these last are many who, while they have come to admit that the war spirit is a diseased condition, or, at best, a condition denoting incomplete development, and while they honestly endeavor to guard against acute attacks, still regard the chronic form of the malady with complacency, supposing it to act as a prophylactic against the acute. Their attitude in this respect has recently been strongly assailed by so unprejudiced an observer as the Czar of Russia, who has pointed out that in the end the increasing armaments must bring about the very condition of active war which they are designed to prevent.

Before proceeding further, let us consider the grounds upon which we arrive at the conclusion that the war spirit is really an abnormal condition. The question is to be settled by determining the true standard of health. Those who draw their deductions from analogies between man and the lower animals, superficially considered, or even from a rough survey of the history of mankind, find much that seems to prove that the war spirit is after all inherent and normal. If, on the other hand, we note the gradual upward tendency of man, and look upon the character of Jesus of Nazareth as the true type of manhood, as a prophecy of what mankind is to be, we have no alternative but to pronounce war and the spirit that leads to it inconsistent with the true health of human character. For my own part I believe that the time is more than come when the continuance of the war spirit is no longer merely an evidence of incomplete development. It now denotes arrested development and disease. Many conditions of life and thought that were normal for our ancestors would be abnormal and un-

p10294

healthy for us, just as there are conditions in healthy childhood, which, if continued into adult life, would be evidences of serious physical and mental disturbance.

The question as to whether the spirit that underlies war is normal or abnormal has far more than a theoretical value. Upon our answer will depend very largely our personal attitude and our influence. It is therefore of great importance that we should have the question definitely settled. Surely, apart from the glare and poetry of war, and inherited ideas in regard to it, no one who accepts Jesus of Nazareth as our ideal can hesitate to admit that the carnage and the unholy passions engendered by war are not the true attributes of manhood, but that they belong to the past. In so far as they may still be regarded as in any sense natural, they are so because of the remains of our inheritance from the beasts that perish, and are not worthy of the man that is to be, or that is. We are called to be the prophets of good things to come, to prepare for and embrace them —yes, suffer for them, undazzled by appearances.

> The future is our home. Not what we are,
> But what we are becoming; this can mar
> Or make our blessedness. The faintest light
> In eastern skies brings day; the western radiance, night.

The real difficulty, however, lies not in the general theory, but in the working of it out. Men say: Yes, war is hateful, and we hate it; but how can it be avoided? They regard the disease as incurable, and the cause of it too deep to be discovered and removed. But many diseases formerly supposed to be ineradicable and in-

curable are in reality neither. The same is, as I believe, the case with war. Let us approach the problem with hope; for in treating this disease of militarism, the attitude of hopelessness takes much of the force out of our influence.

Again, with many the conviction that war and the war spirit are abnormal is weak, and they feel unable to take a really strong position on the question because of the underlying thought that, after all, wars have produced good results. Can they then be wholly evil? May not the objection to war be in reality a fad rather than a principle—a fad of people who overlook underlying evils? It was probably with something of this in his mind that we find the hero in Tennyson's "Maud" saying:

"Last week there came to the country town,
To preach our poor little army down,
And play the game of the despot kings—
Though the state had done it and thrice as well—
This broad-brimmed hawker of holy things,
Whose ear is crammed with cotton and rings,
Even in dreams to the chink of his pence.
This huckster put down war! Can he tell
Whether war be a cause or a consequence?
Put down the passions that make earth hell;
Down with ambition, avarice, pride,
Jealousy down. Cut off from the mind
The bitter springs of anger and fear.
Down, too, down, from your own fireside
With the evil tongue and the evil ear,
For each is at war with mankind."

This is quite right in its positive position, wrong in what it denounces. It unconsciously gives strong support to the effort to banish war; for if war be the consequence of the passions that make earth hell, then there is little more to be said for it. As I have pointed out, war is the eruptive stage of an acute fever. It is therefore manifestly unwise for us to direct all our attention to combating the eruption. The underlying condition of the whole system must be studied, and we must do what we may to limit the contagion and to eradicate it. The comparison to an eruptive fever in the human body does, however, not altogether hold; for in the latter case, with very few exceptions, the eruption is bound to come and is generally to be encouraged rather than otherwise. But with military fever, even when it seems to be at its acute stage, the eruption may at times be averted, and the attack pass off without it, as was the case in the Alabama and the Venezuelan difficulties with England. It is therefore always worth while to make the effort. At the same time it is too true that when the disease has reached a certain stage the eruption of war nearly always follows. The passions of men are aroused, they are afflicted with a form of delirium—for it is a delirium, even when apparently coherent and sober—and this prevents wiser counsels from being even understood. But at such times, as in other epidemics, the most useful persons are those who are not prostrated with the disease. Never are the healthy more needed than in an epidemic, and even though it become so general that the nation as a whole is affected and a general eruption of war breaks out, yet the members of a body politic are not wholly like the members of the human body. All the mem-

bers indeed suffer, but all need not become diseased. The larger the number that remain in health, the sooner will health be restored to the whole body, and the less liable will the nation be to be affected in like manner again. For the disease of war is, of course, largely a disease which primarily affects the mind and character. The stronger the number, therefore, of men and women who are known to be really immune, capable under all circumstances of resisting the contagion of war, the more careful will the leaders of the people be to avoid the exciting causes of war. This shows the true patriotism that there is in a conscientious maintenance of sound health during periods of excitement, and in the stalwart refusal in any way to help or encourage that which is recognized as morally diseased. Even though it may be impossible for a given individual, with the limited knowledge that most individuals have of all the circumstances of the case, and still more limited experience of public affairs, to say how, under certain special conditions that seem to prevail, his nation can avoid war; yet, if he recognize war and the war spirit to be a moral disease, and therefore in its essence sin, he is a true patriot, a true conserver of national health, in maintaining his integrity and refusing to become in any way one who countenances the evil. If, in addition to this, strong in his position that to do evil is always unwise, he maintain in the case of a fresh excitement that the true solution is a peaceful one, he may rest easy under present misunderstanding in the conviction that history will justify his faith.

But we have not yet met the objection that wars have accomplished good. The feeling that they have often

makes the instructors of young people, who may be considered among the moral physicians of society, hesitate in impressing the importance of the teachings of peace. But of what evils could not the same be said? Plagues and poverty have been the means of great good. Think of the personal heroism displayed in plagues. Think of the magnificent instances where the richer have helped the poorer. Think of the increased cleanliness of our cities, which has been largely brought about through diseases engendered by filth. To come more directly to the point, lying, murder, stealing, and other forms of immorality have produced good results. Do we, therefore, justify them? What sin ever committed equals that of those who crucified Christ? Yet what an untold blessing has come to us through it. Shall we, therefore, encourage the execution of good men? Because a part of our country was acquired unjustly from the Indians, do we, therefore, justify the evil? Do we approve of immorality because Erasmus and Alexander Hamilton were illegitimate children?

We believe in God. It would be a terrible strain upon the faith of thoughtful persons in a righteous God if all the results of evil were evil. There is no sin, I imagine, which has not seemed to produce, under certain circumstances, some good, and which, therefore, on the plea of immediate expediency, might not be justified. But we must look deeper than the mere appearances of things. Other evils than war are usually of a more private character and the results are therefore more limited. But war and its results are seen on a large scale, and more especially those results which are dazzling in their character and extent. But while sin is made to serve

good ends, it is also punished. It is an entire mistake to say that war purifies the life of a nation, or that morals are elevated by that which necessitates the defiance of morality. I heard a gospel minister recently quote approvingly Sherman's well-known phrase, "War is hell," and then add, "But there are things worse than hell." No, brother minister, not if we give the true definition to hell, which is not simply the acme of suffering, but the acme of moral disease—that is, the acme of sin. War not only leaves a nation poorer, but it leaves it impoverished in righteousness, morally diseased, with a false ambition and pride on one side and a rankling of hate and desire for revenge on the other. The exceptions to these statements are so inconsiderable, especially in regard to influence upon national morality, as to deserve nothing more than a passing notice.

Let us take, for example, the influence of the civil war in the United States upon temperance reform. It put that movement back more than a generation. Who can imagine a great New York daily at this time undertaking the cause of temperance legislation, and urging it on, as the "Tribune" did before 1860. This is but a small phase of the question. The enormous increase in crime in this country is directly traceable to the war. Turning from our own nation to the wars of the world, apart from its moral evils, think of the priceless monuments of antiquity that war has destroyed, from the first sack of Babylon, the destruction of Nineveh, of the treasures of Greece and Rome, the burning of the library of Alexandria, to the devastations of modern times. War is vandalism. If it has won liberty, it has also destroyed liberty. The large standing army is at once the right hand and

the terror of tyrants. It is sometimes the child of republics, but is always fatal to republicanism.

Yet is not the sword needed to open in heathen lands the way for the gospel. What gospel needs it? Certainly not the gospel of Jesus Christ. When was this more pressed and in greater danger than in the earlier centuries, when Rome proscribed it and sought to crush it? and when was it, so far as outward weapons went, so utterly defenceless? Yet when were its triumphs greater? Because certain modern countries have been opened to missionaries through war does not prove that they might not have been opened by other means. Take Japan, for example, as a modern instance of a country opened by force. Centuries ago she was open to Christianity without the sword, and became closed to it through the unchristian behaviour of the professing Christians. The countries that are opened by the sword are opened by it more effectually to other things than the gospel. Christianity has suffered far more than it has been helped through war, and, if deprived to-morrow of armed help, would be free to resume in all their force and effectiveness the weapons of God.

Again, we constantly hear it said that force is the only argument that barbarous and semi-barbarous people can comprehend. But no one acquainted with history can honestly maintain this position. The classical illustration of the course pursued by William Penn and his friends shows how justice and good faith are stronger guarantees of peace than the sword. The unarmed colony of Pennsylvania was safer with savages around it and in it than were the fortified colonies to the north and the south. Compare the results of the uneven, often dis-

honorable, and military methods practiced in regard to the Indians in the United States with the generally mild and just methods pursued towards them in the great north, first by the Hudson Bay Company and then by the Dominion of Canada, and you have another effectual answer to the statement that savages understand nothing but an appeal to physical force. The recent success of Sir Andrew Clarke in the Straits Settlements is a case in point. With no attempt at subjugation, he has been able to transform the little warring states there into peaceful, law-abiding and prosperous communities. Previously, each, governed by its own semi-barbarous Sultan, was continually warring on its neighbors. The feudal lords were constantly engaged in piracy and in petty strife, so that the condition of the settlements was one of poverty and continual distraction. How was this accomplished? First, by winning the confidence of the people that there was no thought of conquest or of interference with their liberty, and afterwards by inducing them to refer their disputes to himself, and to substitute honest labor for piracy. The Fiji Islands have been brought to a state of peace by means of the British resident, who carefully studied the thoughts and habits of the people, and allowed them to retain their own customs in respect to property, etc., and who treated them with the most even-handed justice. The amount of force used was extremely slight.

The experience of many missionaries in Africa and elsewhere who have proceeded wholly on a basis of justice and peace, point to the same conclusion, while the history of the Doukhobors is particularly impressive. About fifty years ago large numbers of this peace-loving

community were sent off to the Trans-Caucasus by the Russian government to a place where to all human appearance they would be forced to fight or be exterminated. The tribes among whom they were thrown were of the same character as those who recently committed such atrocities against the Armenians. When the Doukhobors came, these commenced their depredations, but the settlers made no resistance, and did not even appeal to the civil magistrate. The wild tribesmen were amazed. "Who can these be?" they said. "Certainly they cannot be Christians, or they would retaliate; they must be the original Mohammedans. We have degenerated. They have kept their purity." And so their enemies became their friends and even protectors. It may be said, Why did not the same rule work out in the same way in the case of the Armenians, who were also non-combatants, for they were not allowed to possess weapons? But there are other methods of warfare than that with swords and guns; and many Armenians, as I believe, had been fighting the Kurds in this; that they, having the more acute intellects, were able constantly to gain the advantage of the mountain people in trade. For this reason, with all our sympathy for them, we cannot regard them as martyrs to peace principles.

In all these examples, and they could be largely increased, we have abundant evidence that even savage peoples are open to the effect of kind and fair treatment. If they be approached in this spirit and their habits and methods of thought be honestly studied, and they treated as far as possible in accordance with their own ideas, they will become our friends and helpers, and not our enemies. It is also of great importance to re-

member that they learn the vices of civilization more readily than they do its virtues, and that therefore, we should carefully guard them against the introduction of liquor and fire-arms. How different from this has been our nation's attitude, first toward the Indians and now toward the Cubans, where one of the first effects of our occupation has been the establishment of thousands of saloons for the sale of strong drink. What a golden opportunity our government has missed in failing to follow in our treatment of the Filipinos the methods followed so successfully in the Straits Settlements by Sir Andrew Clarke.

In dwelling largely upon the asserted necessity for war, I have not wandered from my subject, for there are few conditions of mind that lay us more open to the contagion of the war spirit than that in which we have an underlying conviction that because war has at times produced good results it is therefore to be justified.

The causes of military fever may be divided into the predisposing and the exciting. The strongest among the first is the inherited tendency, which may be described as practically universal. This tendency must, however, be carefully distinguished from the disease itself. As children with strong inherited tendency to tuberculosis may, if guarded against infection and placed under hygienic conditions, entirely escape the disease, so with proper care we may ourselves escape the contagion of the war spirit and guard those under our influence from it.

The teachings of the evolutionist may here come to our aid. If we can get the thought firmly fixed in the

minds of our children that the tendency in man to animal combativeness is an inheritance from our ancestors according to the flesh, the remains of the brute nature within us, and that it is our high privilege to

> "Move upward, working out the beast,
> And let the ape and tiger die,"

we shall have done much to enlist their best powers of mind and character in behalf of a noble struggle and heroic effort, that will bring into play a right warfaring spirit on behalf of normal manhood. This gives us a vantage ground far greater than the mere teaching of tame non-resistance. It is on these lines also that we find a solution to the question so often raised as to whether if our teaching on war be true, we do not cast an undeserved slur upon the military leaders of ancient and modern times. On the theory of development these men, in this respect, were, to use Robert Barclay's expression, "in the mixture." Each age is to have a higher and higher standard as time goes on. The frightfully cruel wars of the Israelites are to be judged, not from the point of view of modern thought, but with a remembrance of the stage of development that they had then attained. We can honor the warriors of old, and seek to be as faithful to our light as they were to theirs. Thermopylæ and Marathon are ours. The tales of chivalry do not make us wish to return to the lower standards of the Middle Ages, but they rightly stir our blood with high resolve. Even in the present day we need not be blind to the good that is in the military leader, or claim that all who have not seen war and the war spirit to be disease and sin, are wholly evil and to be de-

claimed against. We know that many of them engage in war with good motives and an unsullied conscience. We must ourselves remember, and teach others, that the progress upward is slow, difficult and uneven, and that these very men who fail to see what we believe to be the truth in regard to war may well be in advance of us in many respects, and be able to teach us on matters where we have failed to see the true ideal. But all this should not cause us to be unfaithful to that which we have seen—that war and the spirt that leads to it are inconsistent with the true ideal of manhood. It is our place in all humility and teachableness to maintain and teach that which we know. Only in so doing can we contribute our share to the general work of uplifting men. The very fact that our position is still a largely misunderstood one, and that it lays us open to undeserved charges of cowardice and want of patriotism, so far from discouraging us, should arouse us to a sense of the need of our teaching, and to an heroic endurance of hardness and reproach for the sake of a noble cause. To say that we are simply believers in non-resistance is to state the question not only negatively, but untruly. We believe in resistance—yes, and in the use of force; but the force we believe in, whether it be physical or moral, is always to be under the control of love and justice, extended as truly toward the transgressor as toward anyone else. Under these restrictions the force manifested through physical means very soon comes to an end.

An important means, therefore, to counteract the inherited tendency to animal combativeness is to show the child whence it arises, and to instill into him the true ideal of manliness from the standpoint of the ideal man,

as shown in Jesus of Nazareth, and to show him that this is to be actually attained, and turn his energies into that direction where he will find legitimate scope for the higher warfare and struggle.

In considering the exciting causes of war fever, we must remember that the disease is both contagious and infectious, and we may best treat the subject under the head of how the infection is carried. There is, however, considerable difference in its activity at different times. The infection is carried from person to person directly; by clothing (in the shape of military ornaments and uniform), by books and pictures of a certain kind, often by words, and by music (when of a martial character). Foci of infection are discovered in public gatherings, especially on occasions of national importance, in armories, boys' brigades, schools, colleges, and even at times churches. In fact, speaking broadly, the infection is very widely diffused. Almost every newspaper is a vehicle for it, and it has even been found in peace associations, and at times in Quaker meeting houses and homes, which are generally supposed to be thoroughly aseptic.

We cannot go out of the world, and therefore we cannot escape exposure to the infection. The only safety consists in becoming immune to the poison. While there is no form of vaccination that will once for all protect us, there is a very great deal that can be done that will render us practically immune. I am not one who would recommend sterilizing our lives in order to escape infection. I would not, for instance, approve of the tabooing of all literature that endorses and glorifies war. This would rule out the Old Testament and very many writings of the greatest value. Neither would I

distort history to defend peace. Truth is never aided by untruth. For a man to live in an atmosphere of disinfectants and antiseptics, and to eat his meals with all the precautions required in a modern surgical operation, would be intolerable. Vigorous life is the great protector against the onslaughts of disease, and this is more true in the moral than it is in the physical realm, although in both the strongest person, as well as the weakest, requires to be rendered immune. At the same time, while I would not bar out books of the character I have mentioned, or distort history, I should have the greatest pains taken to have history, philosophy and ethics taught from the true scientific point of view. Our knowledge of the past now gives us a vista long enough to enable us to see in what direction mankind is tending, and to behold the hand of God in the rise and fall of nations. Such study shows us that the goal is justice and peace. We can impress this. We can in many cases —I should say in all where we have full knowledge of the facts—clearly show how calm judgment might have avoided the catastrophe of war, and we can enforce the lesson to be drawn from the progress in arbitration, through the hundred successful arbitrations in the past century, to the present concerted effort to establish it as a method for the civilized world. We can give right prominence to the burden of debt, of suffering, of disease, and sin that wars have entailed. We can explain the burden of great armaments, and their attendant evils. We can encourage our young people to prepare essays as to how wars may be avoided, and how nobler methods may be encouraged. We can draw before them a picture of war as it is—pictures in words comparable

to Verestchagin's pictures on canvas—which called forth the enthusiastic commendation of the old soldier, Count Von Moltke. But that general was too wise to be satisfied with praise. He issued an order that no soldier should be allowed to look upon those pictures. He feared that, should they do so in cold blood, and see what war really is, they would be unwilling to continue to be soldiers. We can impress upon our young people that the primary duty of a soldier is not, as is so often said, to die for his country, but, to quote General Wolseley, to kill the enemy. To counteract the contagion of false ideas, let us substitute correct ones. When young people are impressed with the thought that war is the school for all manly virtues, let us remind them of what true manliness is. I think we shall have little difficulty in getting them to assent to the proposition that manliness involves strength and a right independence of character, that while obedience is manly, he is more manly who disobeys a command to do evil than he who obeys it, and that the manly man will do right at all hazards. Then tell them what the Emperor William said some years since to his troops, that they were to obey him as if he were God, and that he would be personally responsible to God for his commands. Show them that, in a blunt way, he truly enforced the military idea. A soldier has no right to a conscience, except as it pleases his commander for him to have it. If he be commanded to steal, as in foraging, he does it; if to lie, as spies must, he does it; if to kill and destroy property, he does it. In our recent war there were Christian temperance men detailed, against their conscience, to serve out liquor in the army canteens. They did it. Is this manliness?

We need to have it impressed upon ourselves and upon the young, that even a sovereign nation is still lower than God, and that however strong it may be, its mandate cannot change good into evil, or evil into good. Murder, robbery and lying are still murder, robbery and lying, whether done in an apparently good cause or in a bad one, whether committed against an individual or a people, whether done for private reasons or at the command of the state. A nation by commanding me to do an unrighteous act does not thereby make that act righteous. It has no more power of absolution than the Pope.

A very subtle way in which the contagion of the war spirit comes is under the cloak of patriotism. The patriotism whose motto is "My country: may she ever be in the right, but my country right or wrong," is at first sight exceedingly attractive. On analysis we find that the sentiment entirely sacrifices the principle of individual righteousness. It is pagan and not Christian. True patriotism is that which seeks the best for its country, and recognizes that nothing is best that is not righteous. A nation can advance in righteousness only as those whose standards are higher than the average insist at all risks upon maintaining their integrity. A government is no more required to do wrong than an individual. It has been well said that if a government were only a mere trustee for the national material wealth and honor, then there would be times when it might be forced to engage in war. But if the government is to serve the truest interests of its people, then there are higher things than these, and the highest are not to be sacrificed to the lower. If the government will not see this, then let the true light bearers see it and act.

Let them testify that war is now a moral anachronism, and that, therefore, it has become sinful. Let them refuse to join in any way with the obscurantists of the present age, who seek to maintain it. A nation is strong in proportion to its righteousness. Even allowing that a case might arise where righteousness meant organic dissolution, still it is for a nation, as for an individual, better to die than to sin.

Without going further into particulars, let us now come to the underlying cause of war. This consists in a false attitude towards God and man. Christ Jesus proclaimed not only peace between God and man, but between man and man. God is not to be approached by his children as the God of the Americans, or the English, the French, or the Spaniards; but as the God of men. Have we not all one Father? Did not Christ die for all? Paul tells us (R. V.) that in Christ Jesus there can be neither bond nor free, neither Greek nor Jew, for we are all one in Christ. Nationalities are, as it were, different households, different families, each under its own management, but all living in the same city or county. Every war is necessarily a civil war. Injury that one side inflicts upon its enemy is a loss to both. Every man slain cripples both. The property destroyed by the victorious party impoverishes itself. Whether we will it or no, the whole world is a vast mutual life and property insurance company, wherein all help to pay for the loss of one. True patriotism recognizes human brotherhood.

"Man is more than constitutions. Better rot beneath the sod,
Than be true to church and state, while we're doubly false to God.

* * * * * * *

He's true to God who's true to man. Wherever wrong is done
To the humblest and the vilest 'neath the all beholding sun,
That wrong is also done to us; and they are slaves most base,
Whose love of right is for themselves, and not for all the race."

It is true that the world is still "in the mixture," and so long as this is the case there is at least danger that wars will continue. But the tendency is upward. Let us not be seduced by the specious plea, or allow others to be seduced by it, that we must accept the inevitable. Still less let us use Bible texts to show that wars are to continue to the end. Such teaching is the enthronement of pessimism so far as the present age is concerned, and means that the kingdom of righteousness, the kingdom of Christ, is never to be triumphant by virtue of the intrinsic power of its king. With all respect for those who hold this view, I believe that it is essentially dishonoring to God, and that it tends to take all the enthusiasm and hope out of our work for the betterment of men. This of itself would be sufficient to show that it is not in accord with the teachings of Christ, the "High Priest of good things to come." As I believe, only an undue literalism in the interpretation of certain passages in the Bible could lead to such a theory. Christ never gave us the true standard of living only to take away our hope of attaining it.

One God, one Saviour, one brotherhood. The truth conveyed in these words will, if accepted, enable us to

get into the true position for observation. Here we shall see how the highest patriotism calls upon us to refuse to participate in anything that tends to maintain false barriers between man and man. The time is ripe for showing forth these truths. The brotherhood of man, arbitration, the idea of fellowship,—all these and kindred thoughts are in the air. The teachers of peace, because they have proclaimed truth, have been backed up by facts that are undeniable, facts of commerce, of political economy, religion, till even the war lords of the earth have been compelled to help in promoting peace. Let us take courage.

Teaching on the lines I have suggested should be given both explicitly and implicitly. Special lectures, presenting clearly one or other of the many sides of the question, will be very helpful. But this should never be done in a way that would give the impression of its being a fad. Healthy minds mistrust fads as unworthy of true manliness. We are to teach the true unity of man, and not simply make a protest against the one feature of war, great as that feature is. There is no peace apart from justice. It is righteousness and peace that have kissed each other. No nation as it now exists could at once disband its armies, because no nation is as yet prepared to be just in all things. Each puts a false honor and outward gain above justice, and trusts to force to support it in its injustice. No nation will submit to an insult such as a Christian man would bear with meekness and dignity. But we are individually to be strong enough ourselves and to train others to be strong enough to refrain from participation, not only in war, but in that which sustains war—that is, in injustice. We are to have no hand in that which is unjust, whether it be in

commercial, political or social life; nor can we condone any unchristian attitude on the part of our party or our country. But a country cannot rise much above the average conscience of its citizens. Therefore it follows that, if we are to live up to the standard here given, we must necessarily often be in the minority, and there must be many avenues of public life closed to us. This fact should be clearly faced, and we should teach our young people that this very abstinence is part of our service, and we are to use it to enforce the need of a manful effort to raise the general standard. Let us teach them that every act of selfishness and injustice makes for war, but that even hidden virtue makes for peace.

Young people love power and admire it. That is right. Let us utilize this very characteristic, and divert their natural desire for combat from its lower manifestations, which are so easy, to the noble effort and struggle for the pure and true. Instead of Boys' Brigades, we may organize peaceful brigades or associations in which they could be taught how to administer first aid to the injured, how to resuscitate the apparently drowned, various methods of life saving, and the way to assist at fires. The advantages claimed for the drill can be better secured by Swedish movements.

In some localities young people have successfully been shown how to settle their own personal disputes by arbitration, which is a most valuable suggestion. Younger children especially can acquire the idea of helpfulness and of chivalrous thought for the weak by being taught kindness to animals.

These suggestions might be greatly multiplied, but after all, valuable as they are, the greatest impression

will be made by implicit teaching; that which a teacher or parent gives unconsciously, because it is a part of himeslf. The child will also learn it unconsciously, and will not forget it. Therefore it is of the first importance that we become saturated with the principles of living that underlie the doctrine of peace, and in the fear of God have it settled in our minds that these shall be, in spite of wordy war and misunderstandings, the guiding principles of our lives.

The text books chosen in our schools merit much consideration. Each teacher must choose what seem to be the best. But in our choice, surely a primary question must be, whether the writer is abreast of the best thought of the present day, or whether he lives merely in the show of things.

The most practical thing in the whole world is a great and true ideal. To follow this is, so far as it goes, to follow Christ. No one can truly be His follower without some frank acknowledgement of His ideal and an adoption of His methods. This is to be His disciple. Faith in Him implies unswerving devotion to His ideals, so far as we know them. This brings us into an atmosphere wholly removed from that of the world, and here we find the true and effectual protection against the contagion of the war spirit. It is by being inoculated with the divine life of Christ, and then by understanding that His teachings are to be applied in this present life under our present conditions. He, the Prince of Love, Justice and Peace, is the Great Physician who can perform this. It is His healing we need. It is His method of treatment we are to adopt in our work to influence others, that the fever of selfishness and of war may cease, and true, manly health take its place.

3 0112 072452201